

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The attached sheets of drawings include updated Figs. 1-4, 6, 9-13, and 15-18. Figs. 1 and 2 have been amended to include the designation of "Prior Art." Figs. 1-4, 6, 9-13, and 15-18 have been amended to include reference numerals.

Attachment: 14 Replacement Sheets.

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 18, 20-23, 26-29, 35, and 56-72 are pending. Claims 18, 20-23, 26-29, and 35 have been amended. New claims 56-72 have been added. Claims 1-17, 19, 24-25, 30-34, and 36-55 have been canceled. No new matter has been added by the amended or new claims.

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to for containing more than 150 words.

The specification is objected to because reference numerals are not provided for the elements of the drawings.

Claims 26 and 35 are objected to because some of the claim elements lack antecedent basis.

Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite because it lacks dependency.

Claims 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,092,875 to Tsuchinaga et al. (hereinafter "Tsuchinaga") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,016,831 to Suzuki et al. (hereinafter "Suzuki").

Claims 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsuchinaga in view of Suzuki and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0115046 to Zinser, Jr. et al. (hereinafter "Zinser").

As presented, the pending claims of the subject application comply with all requirements of 35 U.S.C. Accordingly, Applicants request examination and allowance of the pending claims.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 20-23 and 27-29 are indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter.

***Abstract***

The abstract has been amended and now contains less than 150 words in compliance with MPRP § 608.01(b). No new matter has been added by the amendments to the abstract.

### ***Specification***

Paragraphs 6, 38-48, 50, 53-59, and 63 are amended by this response to include reference numerals corresponding to those added to the drawings. Additionally, "voce" in paragraph 39 has been amended to "voice," and in paragraph 42 "frame" has been amended to "Frame." No new matter has been added by the amendments to the specification.

### ***Claim Objections***

Claims 26 and 35 have been amended to provide proper antecedent basis. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112***

Claim 35 has been amended to properly depend from claim 28. Additionally, "the excitation mapping" has been amended to "the mapping using analysis in excitation space," which finds proper antecedent basis in claim 28. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 is respectfully requested.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103***

Claim 18 has been amended to recite, among other elements, "classifying a frame class based upon the one or more source voice parameters or the one or more interpolated voice parameters." Applicants respectfully submit that neither Tsuchinaga or Suzuki, either considered alone or in combination, teach or suggest at least these elements in the manner claimed. For at least these reasons, claim 18 is in condition for allowance.

In the Office action, the Examiner states that Tsuchinaga discloses, in Fig. 1 and at col. 12, lines 28-31 and 36-58, "classifying a frame type of a destination codec from the one or more input parameters of the source codec" (Office action at page 5). The section of Tsuchinaga referred to by the Examiner discusses a frame-type detector that detects frame-type information from input code data and outputs the frame-type information to a transcoding controller. The frame-type is appended to the code information of each frame (Tsuchinaga at col. 9, lines 51-54). Thus, Tsuchinaga does not teach or suggest "classifying a frame class based upon the one or more source voice parameters or the one or more interpolated voice parameters," as recited by claim 18. Rather, Tsuchinaga teaches that the frame-type detector identifies the frame-type

based on code information appended to each frame. Because Suzuki does not make up for the deficiencies in Tsuchinaga, claim 18 is allowable over the combination of Tsuchinaga and Suzuki.

Claims 20-23, 26-29, 35, and 56-72, which depend from claim 18, are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons, as well as for the additional elements they recite.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,

/Craig C. Largent/

Craig C. Largent  
Reg. No. 56,400

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 650-326-2400  
Fax: 415-576-0300  
Attachments  
CCL/KBC/ka  
61202105 v1